

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: *Adams, J.* Examiner: *Gordon, S.*
Serial No.: *09/815,946* Art Unit: *3612*
Filed: *03/23/2001* Date: *June 10, 2002*

For: *Tie Down Coupling System*

Box Amend
Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

RECEIVED

JUN 24 2002

GROUP 3600

A RESPONSE TO ELECTION REQUIREMENT

Dear Sir:

In response to the Election/Restriction Requirement of April 10, 2002, the following Election with traverse is made in response thereto, and reconsideration of the Requirement is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 through 18 are pending in the case. In the Office Action mailed April 10, 2002, the Examiner has required an election of species between stated species of Figure 5, Figure 5A, Figure 8, Figure 9 and Figure 10. The Examiner has stated that these species are patentably distinct one from the other. The applicants traverse this finding, in that there have only been set forth a reasonable number of species, and the reasonable number of species should be examinable together. If the election requirements is maintained, the applicant hereby elects the embodiment of Fig. 5 with traverse.

Upon a review of the claims, the applicants have determined that the claims now pending in this case that read on the elected species are claims 1-15 and 18. In this regard, claims 1 and 6 are considered to be generic of the embodiments, although the Examiner has indicated only claim 1 appears to be generic. In this regard, claim 6 defines the invention as a tie down coupling system comprising a body member secured in a desired position, and a coupling anchor associated with the body member. The coupling anchor receives a coupling device associated with a tie down member and positively retains the coupling device with the body member. Each of the embodiments identified by the Examiner include these structures, and therefore claim 6 is also believed to be in generic form. In addition, as it is evident from the

correlation of claims to the elected embodiment, the distinctions between embodiments are reasonable in number, and are properly examinable together, in accordance with 37 CFR §1.141 and as set forth in MPEP 806.04(a). In the present application, only a reasonable number of species have been presented, and many of the claims correspond to each of the embodiments. Further, as it is believed the generic claims define a patentable invention, claims corresponding to the various species are properly considered in combination with the generic claims.

In view of the foregoing arguments the applicant submits that the claims are properly examinable together, and the species election requirement should be withdrawn. The application is therefore believed to be in a condition to permit allowance. Therefore the applicant requests early and favorable disposition of this application.

Respectfully submitted,
Hahn Loeser + Parks, LLP

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'S. Oldham', is written over the printed name.

Scott M. Oldham
Registration No. 32,712

SMO/meh
Twin Oaks Estate
1225 West Market Street
Akron, OH 44313-7188
(330) 864-5550

Attorney Docket No.: 6382-39